

8/9/67

Dear Paul,

Your very interesting letter of 8/6 raises a number of things of interest and some that are feedback of my own, uncredited work used by others.

Most of all, at the moment, I am quite interested in what CBS attributed to Alvarez but which, in its entirety, not just the Frame 190 staff, it knew about earlier from me. It was determined not to credit me. I can prove they had my stuff and that they knew this was in it, for they credited one part of "one critic". I may be wanting to do something about CBS, hence everything on, about or from Alvarez, who I presume to be honorable, is of great interest and I'd like all of it, even if inaccurate.

Hal is right. Add to that that I am much more tired than ever. So I will not take time to search out references. My guess is that the second "Alvarez" camera shake I go into at several points in WWII, beginning about pp 212-3 and about six or seven pages later. The 227 is specific. Ray argued the meaning of it with me. I think he says Connolly was hit there. Alvarez failed to note 222, where it is also true. The interesting thing, as CBS has not responded about, is that there are about a half-dozen such points, not just the three Alvarez talks about. I have other, unpublished material on this I'd prefer not to go into here. I'll do something with it soon, a sound, etc., could have

Even the pinpointing of Frames 185-6 is not Alvarez's but mine (WW48). I think it is likely there could have been an even earlier Zapruder reaction. If you can supply it, I'd appreciate a clearer copy of your note so I can send them to someone who is interested in this and who thinks he may be able to do something for me about it. The background blurring is different from that of objects in the car. I would like this as fast as possible, for I am in correspondence with a CBS vice president. Also, I want to make the only outgoing mail, leaving in a few minutes.

I am quite interested in any alteration or suggestion of anything unusual about Frame 295. There is a sharp forward head motion about there that I alone seem to have discovered. You will find that I mention it vaguely in II. I feared no one would believe so violent a disagreement with the official interpretation of the film, so just before publication I went over the ms and weakened this point to have it say merely that the head moves in both directions in disconnected motions. The first is short, sharp and forward; the second (313) violently backward. I really like what Alvarez has. The absence of a single frame here could be crucial. Frame 313, the still is still mislabeled. Even though I called it to official attention last year of shock waves, and the "utter" of the Monarch book is of great interest. Can you get me a copy or lend me yours? I can't speak for the cops or Wuiroga, although I imagine the cops thought Oswald what they call "Red". But Bringuier is pure nut, the only thing pure about him. His case against me was tossed out of court a week ago today. He alleged my correct quotation of his own testimony defamed him. He is right of radical right, close to argis. If you can spare a copy of that "amparts" piece, I'd like it. I do not know if I have it or not, but I'd like a second if I do. Some of that stuff was mine, some given them in confidence in December and some the consequence of Bill and Maggie calling Turner in when I asked them to follow in connection with the question of the speed at which the Zapruder camera

telling me what he learned! That is the "nutman, Gabaldon stuff. The guy we took him to phoned me from Calif. and I referred to Bill. I believe Banister was connected with the Anti-Communist League of the Caribbean.... My phrase for Shaw is "mother hen", very similar to the Ramparts "babysitter".... True about Novel on NEC payroll 2/1. NYTmes had man down there at latest in November. Investigation began 10/66. I knew about it 1/1. He has gone back to N.O. I gather from Alcock he'll sing... If Bringuier is a nut, the others need not be.